

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement of Applicant's claim of priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document, and that the drawings are acceptable. Applicant also notes that the Examiner has indicated consideration of the U.S. and foreign documents submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement filed April 27, 2006, but has crossed-off and refused to consider the English language abstracts of the two Japanese documents that were cited and considered. Applicant respectfully submits that no dates are required for the English language abstracts of the underlying Japanese documents, and respectfully request that the Examiner indicate consideration of the same by initialing and returning another copy of the Form PTOL-1449 with the next official action. Nevertheless, Applicant presumes that the English language abstracts were considered by the Examiner in some manner during the Examiner's consideration of the underlying Japanese documents.

Claims 1-8 remain pending in the application.

Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the pending application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 are objected to because of reference characters therein. Applicant, however, notes that the reference characters in the original claims were deleted in the Supplemental Preliminary Amendment filed in April 27, 2006. Thus, the objection to the claims on this ground is improper.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in the terms "well-known mirror surface plating" and "well-known transparent static electricity preventive materials" of claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8.

In response, claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 have been amended to be definite by deleting “well-known” therefrom. Thus, rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is now moot.

In the Official Action claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochanowski, U.S. Patent No. 6,029,382. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define a feature of the invention and to more clearly distinguish over the applied prior art reference by further reciting that the inner surface of the transparent cover is substantially flat, as attached. No new matter is introduced by this amendment.

A light reflector for a road guardrail of the present embodiment, as recited in amended claim 1, includes, inter alia, a light reflecting body formed with a reverse trapezoidal valley inside of the light reflecting body in a longitudinal direction, and formed with inclined surfaces that close front and rear ends of the reverse trapezoidal valley at the front and rear ends; light reflecting plates formed on a bottom surface and lateral sides of the reverse trapezoidal valley and plated by a mirror surface plating; one of a light reflecting tape attached on the inclined surfaces and of fluorescent paint-coated on the inclined surfaces; and a transparent cover, installed on an upper side of the light reflecting body, that covers a space defined by the reverse trapezoidal valley and the front and rear inclined surfaces, the transparent cover including a substantially flat inner surface.

Applicant respectfully submits that the reference relied upon in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) does not disclose such a combination of features. In particular, the

feature that the inner surface of the transparent cover 10 is substantially flat is not disclosed in the applied reference.

The Examiner appears to assert that the transparent cover is disclosed in the side wall 308, the message 301 and the face member 302 of Kochanowski.

In comparison, however, Applicant respectfully submits that in Kochanowski the configuration of the side wall 308, the message 301 and the face member 302 includes a flat inner surface.

Further, Applicant does not agree with the Examiner's assertion that Kochanowski suggests the reverse trapezoidal valley in column 12, lines 30-40. In this regard, Applicant respectfully submits that Kochanowski does not disclose a reverse trapezoidal valley inside the reflecting body, but "...face member 302 is formed to create specific messages having a desired shape."

Therefore, the teachings of Kochanowski would not result in the invention as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is now moot.

Independent claim 1 is now in condition for allowance in view of the amendments and the above-noted remarks. Dependent claims 2-8 are also submitted to be in condition for allowance in view of their dependence from the allowable base claims and also at least based upon their recitations of additional features of the present invention.

It is respectfully requested, therefore, that the rejections under 35 U.S.C.103(a) and the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 be withdrawn and that an early indication of the allowance thereof be given.


Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and

which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based on prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to be attached thereto.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Kwang-chul CHOI



Bruce H. Bernstein William E. Lyddane
Reg. No. 29,027 Reg. No. 41,568

December 18, 2007
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191